

~~SECRET~~
draft

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

SUBJECT : DD/S response to IG Training Survey

1. In general the DD/S response is most satisfactory. He has concurred in, fully or with minor modification, thirty-two of thirty-four recommendations appropriate to his area of responsibility.

2. The DD/S non-concurs in the recommendation (Tab 2) that Isolation be given a designation that adequately reflects the scope and purpose of this intelligence training center. He rejects it on the grounds of security and the need for new outlays for physical plant and additional personnel. We think he is begging the question. There is already a noticeable trend in the direction of community training in intelligence and pressures are developing that will accelerate this trend. The Agency should take the lead and capitalize on the opportunity to develop better relations with other agencies and to standardize doctrine and training techniques. We realize that time and money will be required and do not expect action to be taken today. All we ask is that some advance thinking and planning take place so we can be prepared when the time comes.

3. Non-concurrence in the recommendation concerned with the use of outstanding public citizens in JOT selection (Tab 21) is not unexpected. The contribution made by some consultants is acknowledged but this does not meet the requirement as we see it. In our own examination of the problems of selection and training we profited by the

reported experiences of industry and government. We also found that the experts in the Agency did not have the answers to many of our most pertinent questions. Why arbitrarily shut off a possible source of wisdom especially when it would cost little or nothing?

4. In the body of his memo the DD/S makes five observations on which we would like to comment:

a. In general this conforms with the views expressed in our report.

b. It is not quite clear what the task force is intended to do. The "essential differences between JOT's and other highly desirable young men" are not as clear to us as they appear to be to the DD/S. If he is adhering to the concept that the JOT is the vehicle for developing potential executives he is overlooking the shortcomings of the present program as pointed out in our report. We agree that the Agency needs flexibility in recruitment and hiring but do not agree that certain concepts are inviolate.

c. This is the most confusing observation of all. We are not opposed to rotation of qualified people into OTR as instructors. In fact we would go further and advocate that the OTR permanent staff be limited to a minimum number of officers required to provide technical competence in training and that all other instructors be drawn from appropriate operational and support components. We also are not opposed to OTR careerists being rotated into operating units although we have reservations about the contributions they make to operating activities. We are concerned with the lack of communication

between operating components and OTR and particularly in matters of selection and placement of JOT's. The assignment of some desk officer from the clandestine service to serve a tour on the JOTP staff is not going to provide the competent judgment required nor will he be representative of the DD/P. Neither will his own career be enhanced by such service. The panels we recommended could at least command representation at a proper level and would provide opportunity for an expression of views from a number of different sources in a relatively short time. We are the least bureaucratic of any staff in the Agency and are constitutionally opposed to management by committee. There are, however, certain situations wherein group representation is the only practical means of communication and we think this is one of them.

d. Here I'm afraid we unintentionally stepped on a DD/S bunion. The fact remains that the statement, taken in proper context, is true. If the DTR was responsible only to the DCI he would undoubtedly be able to better "develop and control unified Agency training policy." I feel reasonably sure that the DD/S is unaware of the DTR's burning desire to transfer his office to DD/P control. We choose not to debate this point.

e. We have not attempted to estimate increases or decreases in costs of our recommendations. Some certainly would require additional funds or the expenditure of time and manpower. The expansion of our training effort may cost more but the investment if wisely made should produce a profit. Can the Agency afford not to make the investment?